

acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, upon presentment by the United States attorney for the said district, returned in the district court aforesaid an indictment in two counts against John S. Mitchell, Inc., a corporation, Windfall, Ind., charging shipment by said company, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended, on or about September 28, 1922, from the State of Indiana into the State of Illinois, of a quantity of tomato paste which was misbranded. The article was labeled in part: (Cans) "Concentrated Tomato Concentrato Di Pomodoro Trade Mark Liberty Bell * * * Contents 12-Oz. Net."

Examination of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the average net weight of 72 cans was 11.43 ounces.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in the indictment for the reason that the statement, to wit, "12-Oz. Net," borne on the cans containing the article, was false and misleading in that it represented that each of the said cans contained not less than 12 ounces net of the article, and for the further reason that the article was labeled as aforesaid so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser into the belief that each of the said cans contained not less than 12 ounces thereof, whereas, in truth and in fact, each of said cans did contain less than 12 ounces net of the said article. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was food in package form, and the quantity of the contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package.

On May 29, 1923, a plea of guilty to the indictment was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$200 and costs.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11608. Adulteration of cocoa beans. U. S. v. 33 Bags of Cocoa Beans. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 17443. I. S. No. 376-v. S. No. E-4348.)

On April 2, 1923, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 33 bags of cocoa beans, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped by J. L. Villaneuva, from Port de Paix, Haiti, on or about February 24, 1913, and transported from a foreign country into the State of New York, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy, decomposed, and putrid vegetable substance.

On May 16, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11609. Misbranding of Fernet De Vecchi. U. S. v. 23 Bottles, et al., of Fernet De Vecchi. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 17482, 17483, 17484. S. Nos. E-4372, E-4379, E-4380.)

On May 2, 1923, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 121 bottles of Fernet De Vecchi, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Philadelphia, Pa., consigned by the Banfi Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped from New York, N. Y., in various consignments, namely, on or about December 2, 1922, and March 29 and April 4, 1923, respectively, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, as amended.

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the product consisted essentially of 39.5 per cent of alcohol, 2.8 per cent of extractives from plant drugs including aloes, a small quantity of alkaloid, and water.

Misbranding of the article was alleged in substance in the libel for the reason that the bottle label and accompanying circular contained statements, designs, and devices, regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the said article, to wit, (bottle and circular) "digestive * * * antifebrile

* * * anticholeraic * * * recommended for people suffering from irritable nerves, lack of appetite, nausea, worms," (circular) "has the property of curing biliousness, giddiness and bad digestion," which were false and fraudulent in that the said article would not produce the curative or therapeutic effects which purchasers were led to expect by the said statements, designs, and devices, and which were applied to the article with a knowledge of their falsity for the purpose of defrauding purchasers thereof.

On May 21, 1923, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11610. Adulteration and misbranding of chloroform. U. S. v. 98 Cans and 109 Cans of Chloroform. Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. Nos. 16495, 16496. S. Nos. C-3670, C-3671.)

On July 5, 1922, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district libels praying the seizure and condemnation of 207 cans of chloroform, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages, in part at Kenosha, Wis., and in part at Milwaukee, Wis., alleging that the article had been shipped in part March 2 and in part May 13, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Wisconsin, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Chloroform * * * For Anaesthesia."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it was turbid instead of clear and it contained chlorinated decomposition compounds.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libels for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down by said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of investigation, and the standard of strength, quality, and purity of the article was not plainly stated upon the container thereof.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the labels on the cartons and cans containing the article bore misleading statements as to the purity of the said article.

On September 30, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgments of condemnation and forfeiture were entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

11611. Adulteration of chloroform. U. S. v. 49 Cans of Chloroform. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 16577. S. No. E-4021.)

On July 3, 1922, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel praying the seizure and condemnation of 49 cans of chloroform, remaining in the original unbroken packages at Pittston, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped by E. R. Squibb & Sons, from New York, N. Y., on or about May 8, 1922, and transported from the State of New York into the State of Pennsylvania, and charging adulteration in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "Poison $\frac{1}{2}$ Pound Chloroform. Squibb For Anaesthesia."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that it contained chlorid, impurities decomposable by sulphuric acid, and chlorinated decomposition products.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia, official at the time of the investigation.

On September 12, 1922, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

HOWARD M. GORE, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*